

Okolona Messenger.

FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE SUNNY SOUTH.

ABE STEINBERGER & SONS.

\$1.00 A Year in Advance.

OUR AIM: To Tell the Truth, Obey the Law, and Make Money. OUR MOTTO: Talk for Home, Work for Home, and Fight for Home.

VOL. 30.

OKOLONA, MISS., WEDNESDAY, AUG. 20, 1902.

NO. 34.

THE SIMPLICITY FAD.



NEW fad is now threatening society and as it promises to be a very helpful and sensible one, it ought to be encouraged, says the Memphis Scimitar. Many blessings come to mankind in the shape of fads and remain in permanent evidence wherever slum-work, dress-reform and improved methods of living are found.

Of late the doctrine of simplicity has arisen to be preached by pulpit and press and to be practiced by those who are earliest seekers after novelties. Four books have been written recently, advocating simplicity in every way and the discussion is finding favor on all sides.

The life of the average American for the past decade has been a very burdensome one, full of complex conditions. Prosperity has come with such rapidity and with such an abundance of good things in its wake that the people are beginning to realize that they are unable to keep up with the times. It is pretty hard for the average human organism to keep pace with the electric devices of the period, and that is the rate at which the world has been trying to move.

Some fake philosopher has somehow sowed the belief in the hearts of the people that the more worldly goods one has the happier one can be. The spirit of the times, born of electrical contrivances and inventions, has multiplied effort, ambition and achievement until restlessness is the common characteristic of the human family, and no one is satisfied. Aside from physical wants the average man believes his brain must be the beneficiary of the thousand and one devices and makeshifts of the day. So writers and publishers have entered into league with the butcher and baker and candlestick maker to cater to the demands of a never-satisfied public.

The result is a wearied, overworked brain that must eventually collapse under the strain of keeping up with all the new books, magazines and daily papers that the mills of the gods of industry are grinding out.

"The Brown Book," referring to the effort people are making to keep up with the times and the useless expenditure of time and money to maintain appearances, says:

"We've shopped early and late and long for this or that piece of dress accessory, which didn't look any too well on us after we got it, but which fickle fashion told us we must adorn ourselves in because it was the correct thing. We have filled our houses with gilt chairs, and onyx lamps, and chenille raperies, and glass bric-a-brac, not always because they appealed to whatever sense of the artistic we may have had, but because our more aristocratic neighbors, whom we felt obliged to follow in all things happened to possess them. Likewise we have made many a call merely for the sake of etiquette, and have gone to many a function solely for the sake of appearances. And likewise also, we have feasted at many a board where the viands were more French and fashionable than wholesome and wise, and which we consumed, not altogether because they tasted so extremely fine, as because the eating of them was the foolish thing to do. And at a few of us, I venture to assert, have built houses beyond our means, worn clothes for which the tailor had to wait long for his money, bought jewels the costs of which were all out of proper relation to our income, and 'taken a flyer' on the market with funds that could have been put to simpler and saner use."

How delighted the good people of "Brook Farm," with its ideal life of years ago, would be if they could know this hope for a reign of simplicity. The world for the past half century has forgotten the doctrine these good old philosophers taught of plain living and high thinking, and in its haste to reach the prizes it coveted it has reversed the lesson.

Even if only a few take up the simplicity fad it will be that much energy conserved out of so much usually lost in the general shuffle and hurry. It may become a fashion, and simple houses, plain towns, less elaborate methods of entertaining may be among its outward and visible forms.

The taste of the world generally has been educated up to that point where it likes violet changes and startling contrasts, and this sudden swerving to high-living, over-dressing and over-eating to life on a simpler plane may so appeal to the majority of people as to make it general and lasting.

THE PROSPECTS OF DISARMAMENT.



THE prospects of a reduction of the vast armaments of Europe do not seem to improve. Emperor William is quoted as having made some characteristic remarks on this subject, King Victor Emmanuel of Italy is the latest sovereign to propose such a reduction. The German emperor has signified his intention to attend the conference at Reval, on the occasion of the Russian military maneuvers, but frankly declares that he doesn't expect anything of importance to come of it, and intimates that he is not desirous that anything should come of it. "Germany cannot consent to impair her finest instrument of offense which is the defense of her existence," he is quoted as saying,

"because other nations are unable to equal it. We can stand the expense, and, besides, I consider that the army returns to the nation all that it costs, in discipline of character and wholesome training of the boy."

The armaments of Germany and Russia are the largest in the world. The present czar and his predecessor have both intimated to the other powers that they favor a general reduction. But there is no likelihood that Russia will ever take such a step unless Germany does so, and at the same time it is altogether improbable that any other Continental country would have the courage to take the initiative.

The Kaiser's reported remarks, therefore, have much significance. It may or may not be true that Germany can easily "stand the expense," and that the discipline of the army is so good for the boy that, indirectly, it benefits the entire nation. But it is certain that Germany will have to stand the expense and that the boys will have to take the discipline as long as William so orders. He occupies a more autocratic position today than any other ruler of Europe, and his opposition to any movement of international importance is therefore certain to endanger its success.

It is probably that the Kaiser's attitude is principally determined by that of France. The latter country can never forgive the empire for wresting Alsace-Lorraine from her, the Germans suspect, probably with good cause, that if the opportunity should ever offer itself, at however distant a time, France would attempt to recover that territory. Thus this small province is the direct and innocent cause every year of the expenditure of vast sums of money by every nation of importance on the Continent.

From one viewpoint the emperor's attitude is much to be regretted. The maintenance of huge armies involves the withdrawal of millions of men from industrial pursuits. But as long as America continues to be the principal market in which food-stuffs are bought for them, our people will try to regard the folly of Europe with complacency.

WE MUST DISOBLIGE ENGLAND.



COMMENTING on the lecture delivered by Sir F. Pollock before the London Chamber of Commerce with respect to England's attitude toward the Monroe doctrine, the London Spectator says: "We ought formally to acknowledge the Monroe doctrine—we already agree to it practically—and to express our willingness to support it should the necessity arise. We might, as suggested a year or so ago, ask the American state department first to state the doctrine in clear terms, and then put on record our acquiescence in it."

So long as wise statesmanship prevails in these United States of America, no European power will ever obtain from our state department a statement of the Monroe doctrine other than that contained in the general terms with which the doctrine was originally framed. For seventy-nine years we have found this general statement adequate for every emergency. No European country has ever failed to understand it, and none has ever attempted, in a serious manner, to transgress it. What England and the rest of Europe would like is not a statement that shall clear their understanding, but a statement that shall bind us within certain metes and bounds and put the doctrine beyond the reach of change or changed interpretation. And that is just what good American statesmanship will always forbid.

The Monroe doctrine has changed radically in intent and purpose since the days of its first enunciation. Or, perhaps, the better statement would be that the condition against which it was first applied has been radically altered. The doctrine was invoked in 1823 for the purpose of staying the Holy Alliance, composed of most of the powerful governments of Europe, which was aiming to spread the monarchical form of government and to obliterate all republics. The doctrine of the Holy Alliance was that kings ruled by divine appointment and that republics were impious. Castlereagh, the British premier, has appointed delegates to attend the congress of the alliance at Paris. Before this congress came to meet, however, Castlereagh was retired and the liberal Canning came to power. And almost the first act of the new British premier was to recall the appointment of delegates to the Paris congress and to announce to the rest of Europe that "England did not hold that kings came from God down, but from the people." At the same time this great premier told our minister at the court of St. James that if President Monroe would announce the doctrine that the Holy Alliance must keep hands off the American republic, England would sustain him with all her power. And at that time the idea that kings ruled by the power of God commenced a decline which soon will banish it from the face of the earth.

At the beginning the mission of the Monroe doctrine was to prevent the spread of monarchy to the American continents and to preserve the United States and the other American republics from European conquest. It was then a defensive doctrine in its fullest sense, and it came at a critical time when the existence of popular governments was really trembling in the balance. But conditions have changed most remarkably during the seventy-nine years. There no longer is a fear that the forms of

monarchy may triumph over the forms of democracy. On the contrary, the forms of monarchy are yielding everywhere to the forms of democracy. Little by little the kings of Europe have been stripped of their power, and little by little the countries of Europe have approached closer to popular government. Nothing could be further from a present day possibility than an alliance among the powers of Europe to spread the area of the monarchical form and to reduce area of democracy. Every crowned head of the world realizes that each year makes in his own country far more of the democratic spirit and the struggle of the future will be to preserve monarchical form and not to extend it. What the rulers of Europe would like to find at this juncture is some doctrine which, by simple enunciation, would stay the insidious conquest being made by American ideas and American example and preserve the monarchical governments as they exist today.

It was the fear of our early statesmen that the powers of Europe would gain a foothold in America and then make conquest of the United States. Such was the dream of more than one European sovereign, and such would have been the very possible result of an onslaught by the Holy Alliance. It goes without saying that today we fear no monarch of Europe, and that we are indifferent to any possible alliance that might have America for its object. However, the Monroe doctrine is quite as vital to our country as it was at the time of its enunciation. Passing out of the character of a purely defensive doctrine, it has taken on the aspect of an offensive doctrine. While no longer meaning that we are afraid of the approach of monarchies as monarchies, it has come to mean that in the struggle for commercial, industrial and financial supremacy we are going to use the power in our hands for the advancement of our own interests. This of course, would not be the presentation of the case that would be made officially by our statesmen or our diplomats, but nevertheless it is the interpretation had by most Americans.

The United States has no doubt of the friendliness of England, and we may be assured that we could count on her prompt assistance if some of her European rivals should attempt to "overturn our great national policy for the exclusion of monarchies. But this will scarcely justify us in showing our hand in the game, which, to all intents and purposes, England has asked us to do. It will be the part of good American statesmanship to allow the Monroe doctrine to stand in its majestic simplicity with an invitation to the world to look it over and decide for themselves as to its range and its meaning. As exigencies arise we shall inform the interested European powers just what the doctrine means when applied to the matters at hand, but we would be fools indeed to give it plain metes and bounds and thus tie our own hands.

Is it not a thousand pities that young men in casting about for "openings" in business are prone to overlook excellent opportunities, and end by trying to squeeze in where there is least room to grow? The unfortunate tendency among our youth is to absolutely disregard places where shirt-cuffs and pressed trousers would be out of place, yet many brilliant successes and large fortunes have been founded on an honest trade well mastered. During the course of a strike in Philadelphia in which 1,500 employees were involved, it came out the other day that many of the skilled workmen earned as much as \$1.08 an hour. As they were on piecework they could easily earn \$50 a week without over-exerting themselves. They were not seriously disturbed by the strike. They own their own houses, and, as a rule, have a comfortable balance at their bankers. How many thousands of men who have for years toiled away in more genteel occupations would find cause for envy in such a condition of affairs. How many thousands of professional men who have difficulty in making both ends meet, would be glad to exchange places with the workman who can make fifty dollars a week! Another great advantage which the man with a useful trade at his fingers' ends has over the average business man who is not his master is the feeling of comparative security. His trade is always a valuable asset, and he is not likely to lose his position for a trifle or through the whim of an employer. Even should he lose one position, he usually has no difficulty in finding something else just as good. Where there is another opening he does not have to enter into competition with all the flotsam and jetsam of the labor market. It is probable that an advertisement of a subordinate position, with few prospects of advancement, in a business house, would call forth at least ten times as many applications as the demand for a skilled mechanic.

As some trusts make an illegitimate use of the protection they enjoy, why should the Republicans of Iowa and not they promise to deprive the trusts of a shelter? Why should the language used in the Iowa tariff is the language of a simple statement? The party which made the tariff will change the language whenever it appears a wrongful use is being made of any of the duties levied by it.

It appears that it was necessary to make an example of somebody in the Philippines and General Jake Smith was "it."

IS THE PRINCE A FOOL?



HE dispatches say that the crown prince of Germany has fallen in love with an American girl and informed his dad that rather than give up the girl he will give up his crown, says the Mail and Breeze.

The question is, is the young fellow simply a young fool afflicted with a puppy love or is he doing a noble thing?

The probability is that he is acting the fool. The girl with whom he is so much in love that he is ready to throw away the prospect of an emperorship in order to marry her, may be a sensible young woman; in fact, she gives a good deal of indication of good sense when she refuses to agree to any left-handed marriage business and insists that she must be the real thing or the stuff will be off. The family record, however, of Miss Deacon is such that it would make a plain, common citizen of this republic a bit leary of entering into any alliance with her. Her father shot a Frenchman and served a year or two in a French prison because he suspected the Frenchman of making love to his wife, the mother of the girl who has captured the heart of the crown prince of Germany.

We are not prepared to say whether or not the elder Deacon had any cause for jealousy or not. If he did, then if we were in the place of the crown prince we would be fearful the daughter might inherit the promiscuously affectionate disposition of her mother; if on the other hand, the old man Deacon had no cause for his jealous rage, then we would be afraid the daughter might inherit his disposition and some day acting on the impulse of the moment, shoot a hole through us. No doubt the young prince feels just now that he can never live without that girl and at his age the emperor business doesn't count for much anyway, but suppose he gives up his chances for a throne and is turned out to shift for himself what will he think about it in say 30 years from now when his back commences to get humped and his wife either gets wrinkled and skinny or else fat and wears a double chin and puffs when she walks.

But when you come to think about it isn't this whole royalty business a miserable fraud? Why shouldn't the son of a king be permitted to go out and marry a nice, bright, healthy girl, no matter whether she is of royal blood or not?

Why shouldn't the crown prince be permitted to marry an intelligent, bright-faced American girl?

Talk about royalty: why she is a princess in a lot bigger and better government than any dinky old kingdom of Europe. Instead of it being a lowering of dignity for the heir to a throne to marry an American girl, it ought to be considered that she is coming down a few notches when she consents to wed the scion of a royal house.

The royalty of Europe has become scrofulous and physically degenerate on account of the fact that the heir to a throne is only allowed to marry into some other royal family. This has gone on until all of the royal houses are related by blood. Queen Victoria before her death, was grandmother to about two-thirds of the rulers of Europe.

How long the people of Europe will consent to allow this gang of royal nibs to sit on thrones we do not know. The force of habit is wonderfully strong. In spite of the fact that some of the rulers are raving maniacs, others feeble minded degenerates and others diseased debauchees, the people still cling to the forms of royalty.

Members of the United States Steel colossal underwriting syndicate have received a third dividend of 5 per cent, on the face of the \$200,000,000 for which they are liable. The syndicate was not asked to advance more than 12 1/2 per cent of this amount, however, so its profits to date are \$30,000,000 on the actual outlay of \$25,000,000 or a return of 125 per cent., less a comparatively small sum in loss of interest. Yet those who have paid this enormous profit have made no complaint about it. Is it because they don't know that they have paid it?

It is finally announced that Uncle Sam will spend no more millions trying to make the Missouri river navigable. It is constantly changing its course in places, and its volume of water is not as great as formerly. Besides, the railroads can do business more satisfactorily if not cheaper than the steamboats. It may be that there will yet develop some sense in connection with the management of the Mississippi river improvement.

The apple crop in this country is estimated to be worth \$34,000,000. That, says the New York Tribune, "is several times as valuable as the sugar beet crop, without as much protection as the latter gets and with not a thousandth part of the fuss."

The establishment of rural free delivery appears to have solved the problem of how to make ends meet in the postal service. The deficit is smaller than it has been in any previous twelve months, for the past 20 years.

Mr. Whitney says the Democratic party has "no issue and no man." Perhaps it would be as well for an old lady like Democracy that has no man of her own to be content without issue.

It is evident that Colonel Bryan doesn't believe in committing himself on the presidential matters, any further ahead than is absolutely necessary.